



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mh
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,891	11/19/2001	Jonathan J. Hull	015358-007400US	1067
20350	7590	05/30/2007	EXAMINER	
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP			PATEL, MANGLESH M	
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EIGHTH FLOOR			2178	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/001,891	HULL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/13/2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This FINAL action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 03/13/07.
2. Claims 1-28 are pending. Claims 1, 6, 11, 13, 18, 23 and 26 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-11, 13, 16-19, 22-23 and 25-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo (U.S. 5,713,021, filed Sep 14, 1995) in view of Kanevsky (U.S. 7,075,671, filed Sep 14, 2000).

Regarding Independent claims 1, 13 and 23, Kondo discloses A computer-implemented method of generating a paper document based upon a plurality of multimedia documents storing multimedia information in electronic form, the method comprising: Receiving input identifying a selection criterion (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17, wherein the search system includes input identifying a selection criterion for searching a portion of multimedia data); Analyzing the multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents in response to the input to identify portions of multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion, the identified portions of multimedia information including at least a first portion extracted from a first multimedia document from the plurality of multimedia documents and a second portion extracted from a second multimedia document from the plurality of multimedia documents (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67, & column 2, lines 1-17, wherein portions of multimedia data are searched based on the users search data. Further column 16 lines 20-28 states "If view objects in non-sequential periods, such as the one included in another file of video, or the one included in non-sequential portions of video, they are grouped as the set S that is a set of non-sequential view objects" here Kondo at least suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portions extracted from a second multimedia); Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches Printing the portions of the multimedia information that

Art Unit: 2178

satisfy the selection criterion , including the extracted first portion and the extracted second portion, on a paper medium to generate the paper document comprising a set of one or more printed pages (abstract, column 5, lines 55-67, wherein portions of data from multimedia based on the user criteria are printed. Has indicated previously Kondo suggests retrieving portions from more than one multimedia document). Both Kondo and Kanevsky deal with multimedia information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include printing of multimedia data. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an additional device capable of displaying multimedia data in real-time when a computer cannot display the data on a display device due to limited availability.

Regarding Dependent claims 4, 10, 16 and 22, Kondo teaches wherein receiving input identifying the selection criterion comprises: Receiving information identifying a topic of interest (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17, wherein the search system allows the user to search based on a criteria that includes identifying a topic of interest).

Regarding Dependent claims 5, 17 and 25, Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches wherein printing the portions of the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion on the paper medium to generate the paper document comprises: Generating a printable representation for the portions of the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion (abstract, column 5, lines 55-67, wherein portions of data from multimedia based on the user criteria are printed. Has indicated previously Kondo suggests retrieving portions from more than one multimedia document); Printing the printable representation on the paper medium to generate the paper document (abstract, column 5, lines 55-67, wherein portions of data from multimedia based on the user criteria are printed.).

Regarding Independent claims 6, 18 and 26, Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches A method of generating a paper document using multimedia information stored by a first multimedia document and a second multimedia document, the method

Art Unit: 2178

comprising: Receiving input identifying a selection criterion; Accessing printable representations for the first multimedia document and the second multimedia document; Analyzing the printable representation for the first multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion ; Analyzing the printable representation for the second multimedia document in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion ; Generating a consolidated printable representation that includes the at least one portion of the printable representation for the first multimedia document and the at least one portion for the second multimedia document that satisfy the selection criterion ; Printing the consolidated printable representation on a paper medium to generate the paper document comprising one or more printed pages (abstract, column 5, lines 55-67, wherein portions of data from multimedia based on the user criteria are printed. Has indicated previously Kondo suggests retrieving portions from more than one multimedia document). Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to analyze the printed representations based on the user criteria. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate a portion of data from different multimedia on a single printed document based on the user specified search criteria thereby saving paper by organizing multiple data on a printed representation based on a topic.

Regarding Dependent claims 7, 19 and 27, wherein: Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches Analyzing the printable representation for the first multimedia document comprises determining at least one page in the printable representation for the first multimedia document that comprises information that satisfies the selection criterion ; Analyzing the printable representation for the second multimedia document comprises determining at least one page in the printable representation for the second multimedia document that comprises information that satisfies the selection criterion; Generating the consolidated printable representation comprises including the at least one page from the printable representation for the first multimedia document and the at least one page from the printable representation for the second multimedia document in the consolidated printable representation (abstract, column 5, lines 55-67, wherein portions of data from multimedia based on the user criteria are

Art Unit: 2178

printed. Has indicated previously Kondo suggests retrieving portions from more than one multimedia document). Therefore at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to analyze the printed representations based on the user criteria. The motivation for doing so would have been to associate a portion of data from different multimedia on a single printed document based on the user specified search criteria thereby saving paper by organizing multiple data on a printed representation based on a topic.

Regarding Independent claim 11, Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches A paper document that comprises: one or more pages, wherein at least one page of the one or more pages is imprinted with text information that is extracted from multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents if the text information satisfies a selection criterion, the multimedia information analyzed in response input that identifies the selection criterion, and wherein the at least one page is imprinted with one or more video frames corresponding to the text information extracted from the plurality of multimedia documents (column 5, lines 55-67 & abstract, column 5, lines 55-67 & column 3, lines 5-15, wherein data from portions of multimedia is converted to textual data based on user criteria. Further the textual data is printed. Also Kanevsky indicates that video data is printed). Both Kondo and Kanevsky deal with multimedia information. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to include printing of multimedia data. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an additional device capable of displaying multimedia data in real-time when a computer cannot display the data on a display device due to limited availability.

5. Claims 2-3, 8-9, 12, 14-15, 20-21, 24 and 28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo (U.S. 5,713,021, filed Sep 14, 1995) in view of Kanevsky (U.S. 7,075,671, filed Sep 14, 2000) further in view of Orr (U.S. 6,430,357, filed Sep 22, 1998).

Regarding Dependent claims 2 and 14, Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1,

Art Unit: 2178

lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches wherein printing the portions of the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion on the paper medium to generate the paper document comprises: Printing text information on at least one page of the set of printed pages of the paper document such that words in the text information that satisfy the selection criterion are annotated, wherein the text information is extracted from the portions of the multimedia information (abstract, column 5, lines 55-67 & column 3, lines 5-15, wherein data from portions of multimedia is converted to textual data. Further the textual data is printed). Kanevsky does teach the textual data from portion of the multimedia information but does not include annotation based on the user defined criteria. Orr teaches the annotation of multimedia data including text data from closed caption information (column 2, lines 55-67 & column 4, lines 50-62), whereas Kanevsky teaches the user criteria used to extract textual data from multimedia data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include annotation of textual data related to a portion of multimedia data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow navigation to specific portions of multimedia data based on the annotated data.

Regarding Dependent claims 3 and 15, Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches wherein printing the portions of the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion on the paper medium to generate the paper document comprises: Printing one or more video frames on at least one page of the set of printed pages of the paper document such that at least one video frame that satisfies the selection criterion is annotated, wherein the one or more video frames are extracted from the portions of the multimedia information (column 5, lines 55-67, wherein the user chooses one section of the video to print based on the criteria selected by the user). Kanevsky does teach printing of data including video data from a portion of the multimedia information but does not include annotation based on the user defined criteria. Orr teaches the annotation of the video information (column 1, lines 55-62). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include annotation of video data related to a portion of multimedia data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow navigation to specific portions of multimedia data based on the annotated data.

Regarding Dependent claims 8 and 20, Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches wherein printing the consolidated printable representation on the paper medium to generate the paper document comprises: Printing text information on at least one page of the one or more printed pages of the paper document such that words in the text information that satisfy the selection criterion are annotated (abstract, column 5, lines 55-67 & column 3, lines 5-15, wherein data from portions of multimedia is converted to textual data. Further the textual data is printed). Kanevsky does teach the textual data from portion of the multimedia information but does not include annotation based on the user defined criteria. Orr teaches the annotation of multimedia data including text data from closed caption information (column 2, lines 55-67 & column 4, lines 50-62), whereas Kanevsky teaches the user criteria used to extract textual data from multimedia data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include annotation of textual data related to a portion of multimedia data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow navigation to specific portions of multimedia data based on the annotated data.

Regarding Dependent claims 9 and 21, Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches wherein printing the consolidated printable representation on the paper medium to generate the paper document comprises: Printing one or more video frames on at least one page of the one or more printed pages of the paper document such that at least one video frame of the one or more video frames that satisfies the selection criterion is annotated (column 5, lines 55-67, wherein the user chooses one section of the video to print based on the criteria selected by the user). Kanevsky does teach printing of data including video data from a portion of the multimedia information but does not include annotation based on the user defined criteria. Orr teaches the annotation of the video information (column 1, lines 55-62). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2178

art to include annotation of video data related to a portion of multimedia data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow navigation to specific portions of multimedia data based on the annotated data.

Regarding Dependent claim 12, with dependency of claim 11, Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches the printing of multimedia data based on a user defined criteria (column 5, lines 55-67 & abstract, column 5, lines 55-67 & column 3, lines 5-15, wherein data from portions of multimedia is converted to textual data. Further the textual data is printed). Kanevsky fails to explicitly teach extraction of textual data from the closed caption information of the multimedia data. Orr teaches wherein the text information is extracted from closed-caption text information or audio information included in the multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents and the one or more video frames are extracted from video information included in the multimedia information stored by the plurality of documents (column 2, lines 55-67, wherein text data is extracted from closed caption data). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to obtain textual data from closed caption data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow navigation to specific portions of multimedia data based on the annotated text.

Regarding Dependent claim 24, with dependency of claim 23, Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches wherein the code for printing the portions of the multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion on the paper medium to generate the paper document comprises: Code for printing text information on at least one page of the set of printed pages of the paper document such that words in the text information that satisfy the selection criterion are annotated, wherein the text information is extracted from the portions of the multimedia information; Code for printing one or more video frames on the at least one page such that at least one video frame that satisfies the selection criterion is annotated, wherein the one or more video frames are extracted from the portions of the multimedia information (column 5, lines 55-67, wherein the user chooses one section of the video to print based on the criteria selected by the user). Kanevsky does teach printing of data including video data from a portion of the multimedia information but does not include annotation based on the user defined criteria. Orr

Art Unit: 2178

teaches the annotation of the video/text information (column 1, lines 55-62). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include annotation of video/textual data related to a portion of multimedia data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow navigation to specific portions of multimedia data based on the annotated data.

Regarding Dependent claim 28, with dependency of claim 26, Kondo teaches selecting portions of data from multimedia information. Further he suggests that portions of multimedia data can be retrieved for more than one multimedia file, thereby including a second portion extracted from a second multimedia (abstract, column 1, lines 55-67 & column 2, lines 1-17 & column 16 lines 20-28). Kondo fails to explicitly teach the printing of the portions of multimedia data. Kanevsky teaches wherein the code for printing the consolidated printable representation on the paper medium to generate the paper document comprises: Code for printing text information on at least one page of the one or more printed pages of the paper document such that words in the text information that satisfy the selection criterion are annotated; Code for printing one or more video frames on at least one page of the one or more printed pages of the paper document such that at least one video frame of the one or more video frames that satisfies the selection criterion is annotated (column 5, lines 55-67, wherein the user chooses one section of the video to print based on the criteria selected by the user). Kanevsky does teach printing of data including video data from a portion of the multimedia information but does not include annotation based on the user-defined criteria. Orr teaches the annotation of the video/text information (column 1, lines 55-62). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include annotation of video/textual data related to a portion of multimedia data. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow navigation to specific portions of multimedia data based on the annotated data.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. [[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 03/13/07 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant Argues: Applicants respectfully submit, based on the discussion below, that Kondo fails to teach or suggest where multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion as recited in claim 1 to print extracted portions of the multimedia information on a paper medium. (See pg 12, paragraph 2).

a) Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that searching view objects in Kondo stored separately from multimedia data is substantially different from analyzing multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents in response to input to identify portions of multimedia information that satisfy a selection criterion as recited in claim 1. (pg 13, paragraph 3).

b) But Kanvensky fails to teach or suggest where multimedia information stored by a plurality of multimedia documents is analyzed in response to input identifying a selection criterion as recited in claim 1 to print extracted portions of the multimedia information on a paper medium. (pg 13, paragraph 4 & pg 14, paragraph 1).

c) The user in Kondo of the user's own accord views the video data to select portions to be associated with keywords, which is substantially different from analyzing, in response to input identifying a selection criterion, multimedia information stored by the plurality of multimedia documents as recited in claim 1 to identify portions of multimedia information that satisfy the selection criterion. (pg 15, paragraph 1).

d) Furthermore, the view objects in Kondo are not printable representations of multimedia information as recited in claim 6, nor does the user in Kondo necessarily view a printable representation of multimedia information as recited in claim 6 to create the view object in Kondo. Accordingly, Kondo fails to teach or suggest analyzing printable representations of a first and second multimedia document in response to input as recited in claim 6 to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion. (pg 16, paragraph 2).

e) Merely creating a printable representation in Kanevsky from a continuous video signal does not teach or suggest that the printable representation for a multimedia document is analyzed as recited in claim

Art Unit: 2178

6 in response to the input to identify at least one portion of the printable representation that satisfies the selection criterion. (pg 16, paragraph 3).

f) Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kondo and Kanevsky, both individually and in combination, fail to teach or suggest the paper document as recited in claim 11 that includes text information and video frames from multimedia information analyzed in response to input that identifies a selection criterion. (pg 17, paragraph 2).

However The Examiner Respectfully Disagrees: Kondo teaches a multimedia data search system for storing and searching features of a portion of data (see abstract). Furthermore in column 2, lines 1-5 he states "Thus, a portion of data i.e. a portion of sequential data, can easily be retrieved to allow users to search data depending on their requirement". Using broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims: The skilled artisan would realize a search system that allows the user to search multimedia portions depending on their requirements would qualify as being "input identifying a selection criterion", because clearly the search criteria must be met to determine which portions of the sequential data are relevant to the users requirement or needs.

Furthermore applicants attacks the Kondo reference for not teaching the printing of the extracted portions of multimedia information.

One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

It is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what the references as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Scheckler, 168 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1971); In re McLaughlin 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971); In re Young 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968).

Since Kondo teaches that portions of multimedia are searched from multiple types of multimedia information it would easily be possible to extract a first and second portion from different multimedia data. The first and second portions

Art Unit: 2178

are just that sequential data searched for by the users query or criteria from the vast multimedia data stored in a database system has recited in column 1, lines 10-15. You could also extract a third portion from a third multimedia and a fourth from fourth multimedia data etc. One of ordinary skill would easily realize that with the teachings of Kondo one could determine the needed portions of multimedia and then print them. However it seems applicant considers the printing aspect to be novel. Therefore the examiner combines the teaching with the Kanevsky reference which explicitly states "...portions of a multimedia presentation, transcribed text, or both are output to a printing device" (see abstract). Firstly the above combination is from the same field of endeavor, second they both describe portions of multimedia information. Since they are both analogous art one of ordinary skill in the art would easily be able to modify the portions of multimedia information determined from Kondo and then be able to Print them with the teaching of Kanevsky. Furthermore applicant merely states that the keywords of Kondo are substantially different from analyzing selection criteria, without providing any evidence showing why the word criteria is so limited and does not encompass querying data or searching based on user requirements which one would interpret has a criteria in the broadest sense.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M,F 8:30-6:00 T,TH 8:30-3:00 Wed 8:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571)272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
May 23, 2007




CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER